DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 491 UD 017 155

AUTHOR Hicks, John S.
TITLE I.E.A.T.H. Program, English as a Second Language (School Year 1975-1976).
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 22p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 20-63422

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *After School Education; Bilingual Teachers; *Elementary Education; *English (Second Language); Grade 3; Grade 4; Grade 5; Grade 6; Homebound Teachers; Home Instruction; *Parent Education; Program Evaluation; *Remedial Mathematics; *Remedial Reading; *Spanish Speaking
IDENTIFIERS New York (Brooklyn); Umbrella Projects

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates a remedial reading and mathematics after school program for 227 third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students who scored at least one year below expected grade levels on New York City standardized tests. The program was a selected New York City Umbrella program funded under a grant from the New York State legislature. The program also taught English as a Second Language (ESL) to 82 parents in the school community. Bilingual teachers from the participating elementary school were sent into both community agencies and private homes where they held English language instruction classes for parents. The major objectives of the program were to help students in both the remedial reading and mathematics program achieve significant growth in their reading and mathematics skills and to help the participating parents in the ESL program to improve their conversational skills in English. Pre and post city wide reading and mathematics standardized tests were used to assess the students' growth. A teacher made test of conversational English as well as the New York City Non-English Rating Scale was used to assess the parents' improvement of their English conversational skills. The findings of the program indicated that the students' average growth in mathematics was 11.9 months for a ten month period and the average growth in mathematics was 11.8 months for the same period. Also, data collected on the pre and post English conversational test for parents indicated that parents met the eligibility criteria of minimal competence in English. The appendix contains the Teacher Made Test of Conversational English. (JP)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED141491

EVALUATION REPORT

Function # 20-63422

T.E.A.T.H. PROGRAM

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

(School Year 1975 - 1976)

Dr. John S. Hicks
Program Evaluator

UD 017155

An Evaluation of Selected New York City Umbrella Programs funded under a Special Grant of the New York State Legislature performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1975 - 1976 school year.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....page 1.

List of Tables.....page 2.

Chapter I: THE PROGRAM.....page 3.

Chapter II: EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES.....page 5.

Chapter III: FINDINGS.....page 7.

Chapter IV: SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....page 12.

Chapter V: APPENDIX.....page 16.

List of Tables

Table 1 - Summary of Grade Equivalent Data on Reading Achievement on Pre-test, Anticipated Post-Test, and Observed Post-Test Scores on the New York City Reading Test.....page 8.

Table 2 - Summary of Grade Equivalent Data on Mathematics Achievement on Pre-Test, Anticipated Post-Test, and Observed Post-Test Scores on the Stanford Achievement Test.....page 8.

Table 3 - Data on Parent Testing of Competency in English as a Second Language.....page 9.

Chapter I: THE PROGRAM

The T.E.A.T.H. Program had two major components in it. The first component was remedial instruction in reading and mathematics to upper elementary school students at P.S. 54 Brooklyn. This program, located in Bedford-Stuyvesant, was run on the basis of after-school small group instruction. Prescriptive teaching was used to identify the deficits and to plan remedial instruction according to the needs of the individual students in the program. Third, fourth, fifth and sixth grade students who scored at least one year below expected grade level on New York City Reading Tests were eligible to participate in the program.

After-school instruction was provided for two hours, one each of reading and math. All students who participated were enrolled for two afternoons per week. The program was staffed with three teachers whose time was split evenly between reading and math remedial instruction. The program served 104 students in the remedial reading groups and 123 students in the remedial math groups. A typical group would include from 15 to 20 students, one teacher, and an Educational Assistant. The ratio of students to staff was low enough to allow an individually centered remedial program. Diagnostic testing by the teachers provided the prescriptions for specific tasks for each of the students.

The remedial reading and math programs were begun on September 23, 1975 and continued into the middle of June, 1976. Because of a variety of reasons, some students left the district during the school year. Remedial activities included group and individual instruction in both reading and mathematics. Reading activities included word attack skill practice,

reading for main ideas, vocabulary enlargement, dictionary skills, and silent as well as oral reading practice. Math activities included a focus on computational skills, mathematical games, puzzles, strengthening basic math concepts, and practice with many math instructional aids.

The second major component of this program focused on the teaching of English as a second language to 60 parents in the school community. These parents were basically representative of the families in the school, and many of the parents of the children in the afternoon program of remedial instruction participated in the evening community based program. In this component, teachers from the school who were bilingual and who understood the culture of the Spanish community were sent into both community agencies and private homes where they ran classes of English language instruction for parents. The classes lasted 50 minutes, and three such classes were held on each of two nights a week. A total of 82 adults participated in this program during the project, which began in September of 1975 and was scheduled to terminate in June of 1976. Fifty-six adults attended consistently throughout the year. The coordinator of both the after-school program and the evening program, Mrs. Hardy, was bilingual, and a parent of long standing in the community.

Two teachers were involved in the evening program. Class sizes ran from seven to twelve per group and attendance was well above the required 50% for inclusion in the program. Each teacher met with three different groups each evening, going from location to location. Since the program was community based, it was felt to be important that the teachers go into the homes and provide instruction rather than ask the adults to go to the school. Instruction consisted of oral practice of sentence structure,

grammar, and pronunciation of beginning conversational English. Group drills, individual work on language mastery, and homework assignments were a part of the program.

There were three major objectives of this project. The first was to help pupils in the remedial reading program to achieve statistically significant growth in their reading functioning. The second objective was to help the students in the remedial math program to achieve statistically significant growth in their mathematics functioning. The third objective was to help the parents who participated in the English as a Second Language program to significantly improve their conversational skills in English.

Chapter II: EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

The three major evaluation objectives in this program were:

Evaluation Objective #1: Pupil participants in the program attending 80% or more of the reading program sessions will improve significantly in reading achievement above anticipation, as measured by the pre-post administration of City-Wide Reading Achievement Tests.

Evaluation Objective #2: Pupil participants in the program attending 80% or more of the mathematics program sessions will achieve a significant increase in mathematics achievement beyond anticipation as measured by the pre-post administration of the Stanford Diagnostic Achievement Test.

Evaluation Objective #3: Parent participants attending 50% or more of the scheduled parent sessions will improve significantly in conversational English as measured by the pre-post administration of teacher made tests.

The instruments used in the program varied with each of the program objectives. For the first objective, the New York City-Wide Reading Test results of March, 1975 were used as the pre-test data and also the selection criteria. Grade equivalent reading scores were taken as reported to the District. All students who participated in the remedial reading

were post-tested using the March, 1976 results of the New York City Reading Test as post data. Data was collected on all students who participated, except in cases where students were discharged from P.S. 54 during the year, or were unable to take the March, 1976 post-test due to illness, etc.

While the original intention of the program was to serve 120 students in the reading component, a total of only 104 students participated. Twenty-six of these 104 children left the district during the year or did not attend the program regularly and were consequently dropped from the program. Nine additional students did not complete the post-testing, leaving a sample of 69 students with both pre and post test data available in reading. The data was analyzed using the historical regression treatment of "Real (treatment) Post Test versus Anticipated (without treatment) Post Test Design."

The instruments used in the analysis of the mathematics remediation program, Evaluation Objective #2, was the Stanford Achievement Test sub-test in Mathematics. The pre-test data was drawn from the city-wide testing in March of 1975, and the post-test data was drawn from the city-wide testing in March of 1976. All students who participated in the mathematics remedial program were tested, except for those students who were not in attendance on those dates. In this component 123 students were enrolled, twenty-six left the school during the year, and six students did not complete the post-testing due to illness, etc. Pre and post test information was available on 91 students.

The instruments used in Evaluation Objective #3, English as a Second Language, included a Teacher Made Test of Conversational English,

as well as the New York City Non-English Rating Scale. Both of these scales were administered at the start of the program in September of 1975 as pre-tests and again in May of 1976 as post tests. Results of the Teacher Made Test and the Non-English Rating Scale were analyzed using a correlated t test on pre and post raw scores. While a total of fifty-six adults participated in the program during the year, pre and post test data on the Teacher Made Test of Conversational English was available on only 25 of the parents. The adults responded poorly to the need to collect data, and in some cases refused to participate in the post testing.

Data from the Non-English Rating Scale was available for fifty-six adults on a pre and post basis. This test provided a categorical rating (A through F) of English language performance. Since the pre and post data was in the form of categorical ratings, a chi-square analysis of shifts in the ratings across categories was applied to this data. It should be noted that the data available for this aspect of the program was substantially greater than that on the Teacher Made Test of Conversational English.

Chapter III: FINDINGS

The data utilized to evaluate objective #1 consisted of reading achievement scores of elementary school aged children at P.S. 54 Brooklyn. Table 1 presents a summary of this information on reading achievement.

Table 1 - Summary of Grade Equivalent Data on Reading Achievement on Pre-Test, Anticipated Post, and Observed Post Test Scores on the New York City Reading Test.

Group	N	Pre-Test Mean	Anticipated Post-Test Mean	Observed Post-Test Mean	Value of t	Level of Significance	Per Cent Attendance
Grade 3	16	2.52	2.96	3.72	+4.507	.01	90.6
Grade 4	21	3.40	3.81	5.03	+7.148	.01	92.2
Grade 5	21	3.85	4.20	5.27	+5.054	.01	90.2
Grade 6	11	4.28	4.63	5.51	+11.054	.01	91.2
ALL	69	3.47	3.86	4.88	+10.874	.01	91.1

It can be seen from the above data that the students presented significant growth in reading, both as a whole group, and when the students were grouped according to 75-76 grade level. It should also be noted that the attendance was quite high; 91.1% of all possible sessions were attended. The average gain in reading achievement from March of 1975 to March of 1976 was 14.1 months.

Table 2 presents a summary of this information on evaluation objective #2, a significant increase in mathematics achievement scores.

Table 2 - Summary of Grade Equivalent Data on Mathematics Achievement on Pre-Test, Anticipated Post-Test, and Observed Post-Test Scores on the Stanford Achievement Test.

Group	N	Pre-Test Mean	Anticipated Post-Test Mean	Observed Post-Test Mean	Value of t	Level of Significance	Per Cent Attendance
Grade 3	22	2.27	2.63	3.51	+10.694	.01	89.7
Grade 4	26	3.29	3.68	4.63	+11.847	.01	91.2
Grade 5	27	3.44	3.73	4.56	+13.284	.01	91.0
Grade 6	16	4.03	4.35	4.96	+ 5.933	.01	90.1
ALL	91	3.22	3.56	4.40	+20.489	.01	90.6

The above data suggests significant growth in mathematics achievement for all pupils who participated, as well as for each grade level. The average gain in mathematics achievement was 11.8 months for the period from March of 1975 to March of 1976. It can also be noted that the levels of reading achievement for comparable groups were higher than the levels of achievement in mathematics. The very high levels of attendance, 90.6%, speaks well of the students' reaction to the program.

Table 3 presents the results of the data analysis related to evaluation objective #3, the growth of skill in conversational English on the part of parents in the evening program. For simplicity both the results of the Teacher Made Test of Conversational English and the Non-English Rating Scale of the City of New York are presented together in this table.

Table 3 - Data on Parent Testing of Competency in English as a Second Language.

Type of Data	N	Statistical Measure Used	Calculated Value of Measure	Level of Significance
1. Teacher Made Test of Conversational English	25	t test	+ 7.287	.01
2. Non-English Rating Scale of the City of New York	56	chi-square	+23.017	.01

Table 3 indicates that significant results were recorded on both instruments which were used to measure the growth on the part of adults in English language usage. It should be noted that the Teacher Made Test of Conversational English, while containing a total of 92 items, remains

an unstandardized instrument. This instrument appeared lengthy to the adults, perhaps explaining why so few of the adults completed the testing on both a pre and post basis. The second instrument, the New York City Non-English Rating Scale, presents much more substantial data, and is used in evaluating English language competency on a much wider basis.

In general, this evaluator would rate the facilities and the materials utilized in this project as excellent. The afternoon program of remedial math and reading instruction used three regular classrooms in P.S. 34, one of which was a mathematics laboratory. There was an abundance of remedial materials in both reading and mathematics, both commercially prepared as well as teacher made materials. The evening program with adults also had more than a sufficient amount of materials.

This project is certainly meeting the needs of the target population of the proposal. The students in the afternoon program presented evidence of both reading and mathematics retardation as called for in the proposal. The pupils served were certainly eligible for the remedial program. There appeared to be a degree to which the program did not meet the projected 120 students in the afternoon remedial program, since only 104 students participated in the remedial reading component, while 123 students did participate in the mathematics program.

The attitudes of both the students and teachers who participated in the after school remedial program were encouraging to this observer. A great deal of work went into keeping the attendance of the students high, and part of the success of the program has to be attributed to the fine efforts of the Project Coordinator and her ability and her willingness to work with the parents and the children in this program. Her bilingual

background, and the fact that she knew so much of the culture and the community, were very important. There were few discrepancies between the proposed program and the program which was observed by this evaluator. The program is certainly serving the needs of the specific target population for which it was designed.

In the evening component, the evidence suggests that 82 separate adults participated during the year. Data was collected on a pre and a post test basis for 56 out of 60 cases called for in the proposal. This aspect of the program clearly met the projected goals. From the field visits of the evaluator it was easy to ascertain that the parents met the eligibility criteria of minimal competence in English. Parent participation and parent attitudes toward this component were exceptional. The parents were enthusiastic in their desire to become competent in conversational English. The skills and attitudes of the project coordinator and the teachers in the program were exceptionally good. Several recommendations from the last evaluation of the program were implemented during the current year's activities. Specifically, the program was recycled as recommended. An increase to twice the size of the program was recommended, but due to a lack of additional funds allocated to this project, this recommendation could not be implemented. Obviously the failure of the program to increase its own size is outside of its control. An additional paraprofessional was hired for the afternoon part of the program in agreement with the recommendation of the previous evaluation.

A recommendation for bilingual teachers and teachers of Spanish heritage for the evening program with the parents was partially satisfied. The teachers of the evening classes are obviously proficient in

conversational Spanish while they are not of Spanish heritage and culture. This did not appear to this evaluator to be seriously damaging the program. Additional host homes for the evening component were also provided this year, as per the recommendations of the last evaluation. Finally, better publicity and dissemination were recommended for the evening program. This was met by coordinating the evening program with several community agencies, and the fact that 82 parents throughout the year participated in the program attests to its successful publicity.

Chapter IV: SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The statistical evidence reported in this evaluation supports the conclusion that this project was highly successful. The data suggests significant academic growth in reading and mathematics functioning. The average growth in reading was 14.1 months for a ten month period. The average growth in mathematics achievement was 11.8 months for the ten month period. Statistical measures, t scores, suggest significance at the .01 level in both reading and mathematics using the standard historical regression formula.

Evidence from this report suggests a basic conclusion found in much of the achievement testing in schools, that is, the older the groups of children, the further below expected grade level functioning the average scores usually appear. Clearly, however, this program was successful in reducing this discrepancy between age level and functioning in reading and mathematics. For the above reasons, and in light of the large amount of significantly positive evidence in this project, this evaluator would make the following specific recommendations.

1. It would be recommended that a fourth teacher be hired for the after school program, so that there might be two reading teachers and two math teachers. The target population would then increase to 160 children for the next school year for both reading and mathematics instruction. The addition of the fourth teacher, a reading specialist with experience in the fifth and sixth grades, would help to round out the teaching staff of the afternoon program.

2. While this program presented significant data in reading and mathematics, it appeared to take a toll on the teachers involved. Since all of the teachers who worked in the after school program were community teachers who had taught all day, on occasion it seemed that to work four extra afternoons was pushing the staff to the limit of their energy. Perhaps if the target population was set at 160 children, with each teacher serving forty children, the teachers should be limited to working only two days per week in the after school program. This would require four teachers for each of two sets of days, or eight teachers. It might also be suggested that some students would respond well to female teachers, and if security was not a problem, perhaps some female teachers should be recruited for the after-school program.

3. The evidence from this component also suggests that greater efforts should be made to encourage 5th and 6th grade students to participate since the degree of achievement lag increased as the students approached the sixth grade.

4. It would seem logical to recommend that the reading program should be stressed more, and attempts to bring that population up to the target population should be made. This would probably require more time from the

Project Coordinator, and the recommendation that she be used an additional hour each day is suggested. If and as the project grows as a response to its success, the need for coordination with community programs and with parents will become greater.

The evidence from the evening components of teaching English to Spanish speaking adults in their homes appears genuinely positive. Statistically significant positive shifts in the language skills of the parents in English usage were reported on two instruments. Both data analyses reported significantly positive shifts at the .01 level. It was this evaluator's conclusion that this element of a community based English as a Second Language program of instruction did much to maintain communication between a large number of community families and the school. The successful results lead to a very strong recommendation that this aspect of the total program be continued, with the following specific recommendations for improvement.

1. This part of the project appeared to be operating at or near the maximum [redacted]. It would be recommended that the target population be maintained at 60 parents or community members, which appears appropriate in light of the resources of the project.

2. This evaluator would recommend that the Teacher Made Test of Conversational English be dropped from use in the project. It appeared to be too lengthy, and the parents' reactions to it were very negative. The other instrument, the New York City Non-English Rating Scale, seemed much more appropriate for use in the project.

3. The Project Coordinator appeared to be strikingly appropriate for this component, and worked exceptionally with the adults in this

community project. While her time appeared stretched in many directions, the coordinator seemed uniquely competent in understanding the community. Being bilingual herself, a very strong recommendation is made that she should be given more time tc devote to this combined project which seems to be so appropriate for both the school children as well as the adults in this community.

In conclusion, a very strong recommendation for continuation of the project is made, with the recommendation also that this model project be duplicated and expanded if at all possible.

APPENDIX

1. Teacher Made Test of Conversational English.....page 17a.

TEACHER MADE TEST OF CONVERSATIONAL ENGLISH

T.E.A.T.H. PROGRAM
195 Sanford Street
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11205

Mrs. Carmen Hardy
Coordinator

Class_____ Name_____

Date_____

Reading Inventory

Grammar

1. He _____ a very good boy. (is, are)
2. Robert and Mary _____going to school. (is, are)
3. They _____very happy. (isn't, aren't)
4. She _____going to the party. (isn't, aren't)
5. John _____very smart. (were, was)
6. We _____going home. (was, were)
7. They _____going to play baseball today.(wasn't,weren't)
8. John _____crying. (wasn't, weren't)
9. John _____190 Hart Street. (lives on, lives at)
10. She _____Fulton Street. (lives on, lives at)
11. Do you have _____boys? (to, two, too)
12. I will go _____. (to, two, too.)
13. He _____all his homework. (do, does)
14. What _____you enjoy? (do, does)
15. Yolanda _____nine brothers. (has, have)
16. Peter and Robert _____three dollars.(have, has)
17. Mary _____like Robert. (doesn't, don't)
18. What _____you like? (doesn't, don't)
19. I _____very old. (am, is)
20. Mike _____ten years old. (am, is)

PAST TENSE SHOW the past tense of the following present words.

Present	Past
1. cry	_____
2. work	_____
3. run	_____
4. jump	_____
5. walk	_____

List the Months: List the months of the year in order.

1._____ 5._____ 9._____
2._____ 6._____ 10._____
3._____ 7._____ 11._____
_____ 8._____ 12._____

List your home address:_____

List the seasons of the year:

1._____ 2._____ 3._____ 4._____

Write two telling sentences:

1.

2.

Write two asking questions:

1.

2.

Complete the following in order to make a sentence.

1. Where are

2. John is

Change the following words from singular to plural:

1. work_____ 4. coat_____
2. hat_____ 5. man_____
3. ball_____

CONTRACTIONS: Write a contraction for each pair of words.

1. He is _____
2. They are _____
3. I am not _____
4. Would not _____
5. Have not _____

Change each sentence to make it correct:

1. he is nine years old? _____
2. robert and mary is happy _____
3. how is you doing _____
4. Do you like mi friend? _____
5. i is tree years old? _____

Write a letter to a friend:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Reading Comprehension

John walks five blocks to school every day. He likes school very much. His best subject is social studies. He does not like math. John's favorite teacher is Mr. James. Mr. James is a very tall man. John always gets a lot of homework every night.

When John comes home from school, the first thing he does is to drink milk and eat cookies. Then he does his homework.

Answer the following questions:

1. What subject doesn't John like?
2. Does John get homework every night?
3. What is the first thing John does when he comes home from school?

MATCHING	COLUMN I	COLUMN II
1. blue	_____	a. a drink
2. Brooklyn	_____	b. a weather condition
3. sofa	_____	c. vehicle
4. juice	_____	d. a part of the body
5. automobile	_____	e. to buy food at
6. elbow	_____	f. a color
7. supermarket	_____	g. a borough of N.Y. City
8. breakfast	_____	h. a meal
9. baseball	_____	i. furniture
10. snow	_____	j. a game

ORAL COMPREHENSION -- TEST PICTURE

1. What is the red building?
2. Where are these children going?
3. What is the lady doing?
4. What is on top of the school building?
5. What is the man driving?

VOCABULARY

1. Tuesday is (a) a house, (b) a day, (c) a month, (d) a color.
2. Morning is (a) a friend, (b) a time of day, (c) an animal, (d) a kind of weather.
3. Snow is (a) cold, (b) hot, (c) warm, (d) sunny.
4. A doctor is (a) a lawyer, (b) a factory, (c) helps sick people, (d) is a nurse.
5. A mailman (a) delivers letters, (b) works in a restaurant, (c) teaches in school, (d) works in a hospital.
6. Noon is (a) 3 AM, (b) 7 PM, (c) 12 o'clock, (d) 2 AM.
7. A man is (a) a car, (b) a person, (c) a building, (d) a state.
8. Ears are for (a) seeing, (b) smelling, (c) talking, (d) hearing.
9. The head of New York City Government is called a :
   (a) the King, (b) the Governor, (c) the Mayor, (d) the President.
10. A smiling child is (a) sad, (b) frightened, (c) big, (d) happy.